

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_110379
Title of the Manuscript:	Personality in the semiotic system of culture: Lana Del Rey - Kate Silverton - Andrey Golov
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 1.7

### **PART 1:** Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Manuscript delves into 'personality' in modern culture through diverse cultural examples. Interdisciplinary, yet stronger ties to current scientific debates or applications would heighten its impact.</li><li>2. The title accurately reflects the content. However, to enhance clarity and attract a broader readership, consider a title that succinctly captures the essence of the study while appealing to a wider audience. For example, "Exploring Cultural Semiotics of Personality through Literary Analysis".</li><li>3. The abstract is generally comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study's purpose, methodology, and key findings. However, it could benefit from a more concise summary of the practical results and their implications for the scientific community.</li><li>4. The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate, with well-defined sections such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. However, consider refining the transition between subsections to improve the overall flow of the narrative. Ensure that each subsection serves a clear purpose in advancing the main argument.</li><li>5. The manuscript appears scientifically sound, integrating theoretical frameworks and empirical analyses effectively. However, consider providing more explicit connections between the theoretical concepts discussed and their practical implications. Additionally, check for clarity and precision in scientific terminology to enhance the overall rigor of the manuscript.</li><li>6. The references are generally adequate, covering a range of disciplines relevant to the study. To enhance the scholarly depth, consider incorporating more recent references, particularly those related to contemporary discussions on semiotics, cultural studies, and personality research. Ensure that the references directly contribute to the study's theoretical framework and findings.</li></ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The text is well-written and exhibits a scholarly tone. However, I would recommend a few minor revisions to enhance clarity and precision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>Clarity:</b> Some sentences are complex and could benefit from simplification for easier comprehension. Ensure that each sentence conveys a single, clear idea.</li><li>2. <b>Consistency:</b> Double-check for consistency in the usage of terminology and ensure that key concepts are consistently defined and applied throughout the manuscript.</li><li>3. <b>Transition Phrases:</b> Consider incorporating transition phrases to improve the flow between paragraphs and subsections, aiding the reader in following the logical progression of the argument.</li><li>4. <b>Precision:</b> Ensure precise usage of scientific terminology, especially when discussing theoretical concepts. This helps maintain scholarly rigor.</li></ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>Additional Suggestions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consider incorporating a brief section in the introduction that explicitly outlines the potential contributions of the study to existing knowledge.</li><li>• Ensure clarity in the definition and operationalization of key concepts, such as "ontological personality" and "phenomenological personality."</li><li>• Provide more explicit connections between the theoretical concepts discussed and the practical examples analyzed in the results section.</li><li>• Check for consistency in terminology usage throughout the manuscript.</li></ul>	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Consider a brief reflection on potential limitations of the study and suggestions for future research in the conclusion.</li></ul> These suggestions aim to enhance the manuscript's clarity, impact, and scholarly rigor.	
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samina Bashir
Department, University & Country	University of Education, Pakistan